



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/335,268	06/17/1999	JOHN S. HENDRICKS	5263	6270

7590 10/28/2005

JOHN K HARROP
DOSEY & WHITNEY LLP
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE
SUITE 300 SOUTH
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/335,268	HENDRICKS, JOHN S.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-21, 23-29, 40-50 and 52-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-21, 23-29, 40-50 and 52-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 8/15/2005.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 11, 12, 22, and 51 have been canceled. Claims 13-21, 23-29, 40-50, and 52-58 are pending in the case. Claims 13, 20, 28, 40, 42, 49, and 57 are independent claims.

3. The rejections of claims 13, 15-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas et al, hereinafter Lucas (Pat. # 5,499,330, 3/12/96, filed on 9/17/93), in view of Cassorla et al, hereinafter Cassorla (Pat. # 5,146,552, 9/8/92, filed on 2/28/90), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

4. The rejections of claims 14, and 43 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas, in view of Cassorla, and further in view of Barnes, "10 Minute Guide to Windows 3.1, Alpha Books, 1992, pp.60-64, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Priority

5. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 120 is acknowledged CIP of 08/160281, filed on 12/2/93.

Drawings

6. The drawings filed on 6/17/1999 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Objections

7. Claims 20-21, 23, and 25-27 remain objected to because of the following informalities:
“a portion the electronic book” claim 20, lines 3-4. This would be better written as “a portion of the electronic book” Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The rejections of claims 11-58 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 20-21, 23, 25-29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas et al, hereinafter Lucas (Pat. # 5,499,330, 3/12/96, filed on 9/17/93), in view of Cassorla et al, hereinafter Cassorla (Pat. # 5,146,552, 9/8/92, filed on 2/28/90).

Regarding independent claim 20, Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents, which contain strings, images, etc,—*the displaying step includes displaying the content from the information source as an inset image within the displayed portion of the document*-- on a screen or viewer. A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—*receiving a request from the subscriber for displaying at least a portion and content from an information source* -- for defining parent-child relationships among the documents (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7, col.4, lines 3-9).

Moreover, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects—*information source* (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.3-4). In other words, the document objects are displayed, and formatted simultaneously as commanded by the user. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *an electronic book*. However, Cassorla teaches the highlighting, and annotating electronic books, which contain (col.3, lines 7-35). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, and Cassorla, because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive way (col. 1, lines 31-54). This would provide the benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive.

Claim 21 is directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 12, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 22, Lucas teaches the moving, and displaying of the document objects or pieces of paper in a screen(col.10, lines 29-50).

Regarding claim 25, which depends on claim 20, Lucas teaches the displaying of document objects or pieces of paper in a tiled fashion—*side-by-side* (col.10, lines 29-67, fig. 3-4).

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 20, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects—*information source* (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the user tiles the document pages in a U-shaped configuration, thereby uncovering background documents hidden documents in the foreground—*reversing a position of the displayed portion*.

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 20, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects—*information source* (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, col.4, lines 3-9,fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the user tiles the document pages in a U-shaped configuration, thereby uncovering background documents hidden documents in the foreground—*receiving a video signal as the content from the information source* to display the document objects as commanded by the user.

Regarding independent claim 28, Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents, such as scanned documents, which contain strings, and images—*inset image--* on a screen or viewer.

Art Unit: 2178

A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—*receiving a request from the subscriber for displaying at least a page and content from an information source* -- for defining parent-child relationships among the documents (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7, col.4, lines 3-9).

Moreover, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects—*information source* (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the document objects are displayed, and formatted simultaneously as commanded by the user. The user tiles the document pages in a U-shaped configuration, thereby uncovering background documents hidden documents in the foreground—*display a portion of the page otherwise concealed by the inset image*. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *an electronic book*. However, Cassorla teaches the highlighting, and annotating electronic books (col.3, lines 7-35). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, and Cassorla, because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive way (col. 1, lines 31-54). This would provide the benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive.

Regarding claim 29, which depends on claim 28, Lucas teaches the moving, and displaying of the document objects, such as scanned images or pieces of paper in a screen(col. 1, lines 50-54, col.10, lines 29-50). In other words, the image and the document object is moved to a new location by the user, and displayed by the computer.

Art Unit: 2178

11. Claims 13-19, 40-50, 52, and 54-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas et al, hereinafter Lucas (Pat. # 5,499,330, 3/12/96, filed on 9/17/93), in view of Cassorla et al, hereinafter Cassorla (Pat. # 5,146,552, 9/8/92, filed on 2/28/90), and further in view of Kuno et al, hereinafter Kuno (Pat. # 5,467,102, 11/14/95, continuation filed on 8/31/93).

Regarding independent claim 13, Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents on a screen or viewer. A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—*receiving a request from the subscriber for displaying at least one page --* for defining parent-child relationships among the documents (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7).

Moreover, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.3-4). In other words, the document objects are displayed, and formatted simultaneously as commanded by the user. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *an electronic book, and a viewer having a plurality of hardware screens*. However, Cassorla teaches the highlighting, and annotating electronic books (col.3, lines 7-35). Kuno teaches the display of a document on two separate hardware display screens (col.4, lines 36-67, fig. 1, 10C-D2A-2B). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, Cassorla and, Kuno because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive way (col. 1, lines 31-54). Kuno discloses eliminating the drudgery of having to switch the pages of an electronic book (col.1 , lines 34-67. This would provide the benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive, less cumbersome, and more effective.

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 13, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.3-4). In other words, multiple document objects are displayed simultaneously as commanded by the user. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *formatting the page for display on three screens*. However, Kuno teaches the display of a document on two separate hardware display screens (col.4, lines 36-67, fig. 1, 10C-D2A-2B). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, Cassorla and, Kuno because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive way (col. 1, lines 31-54). Kuno discloses eliminating the drudgery of having to switch the pages of an electronic book (col.1 , lines 34-67. This would provide the benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive, less cumbersome, and more effective.

Claim 15 is directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 12, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 13, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the document objects that are displayed in the foreground are magnified, and the document objects in the background are reduced.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 13, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the document objects that are displayed in the foreground are magnified, and the document objects in the background are reduced.

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 13, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the document objects are detected and those that are displayed in the foreground are magnified, and the document objects in the background are reduced.

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 18, Lucas teaches the moving, and displaying of document objects or pieces of paper in a screen(col.10, lines 29-50). In other words, the document objects that are moved—*detecting change*--, and then displayed as commanded by the user, such as the moving or formatting of entire strands of documents.

Claims 40-50, 52, and 54-58 are directed towards an apparatus for implementing the steps found in claims 13, 15, 13-21, 23, and 25-29 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Art Unit: 2178

12. Claims 24, and 53 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas, in view of Cassorla, and further in view of Levine et al, hereinafter Levine (Pat. # 5,625,833, 4/29/97, continuation filed on 4/7/93).

Regarding independent claim 24, the limitations are directed towards the limitations of claim 20, and therefore are similarly rejected. However, Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents, which contain strings, and images, on a screen or viewer. A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—*receiving a request from the subscriber for displaying at least one page* -- for defining parent-child relationships among the documents (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7, col.4, lines 3-9). Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *wrapping around the displayed content from the information source*. However, Levine teaches automatically wrapping a word to the next line, when a typing cursor comes close by to margins found in the document (col.17, lines 66-col.18, line 12). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, Cassorla, and Levine to wrap text around the document contents, because teaches above automatically aligning the text in accordance to pre-established margins. This has the benefit of allowing whole document portions, such as image, to remain in the document without affecting the layout of the portions, and user to view the whole document.

Claim 53 is directed towards an apparatus for implementing the steps found in claim 24, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13-19, 40, 42, 49, 57, 41, 44-48, 50-52, 54-55, 58, 14, 43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Applicants indicate that Lucas fails to teach the display of a page in multiple screens (page 15-18). The Applicants are directed towards the new rejections introduced as a result of the amendment above.

14. Applicant's arguments filed 8/15/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claims 20, and 22, the Applicants indicate that Lucas fails to teach the display of an inset image on a screen (page 17, parag.2). The Examiner disagrees, because Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents, which contain strings, images, etc.--*the displaying step includes displaying the content from the information source as an inset image within the displayed portion of the document*-- on a screen or viewer. A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—*receiving a request from the subscriber for displaying at least a portion and content from an information source* -- for defining parent-child relationships among the documents (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7, col.3, lines 3-9).

Regarding claim 27, the Applicants indicate that Lucas fails to teach receiving a video signal as the content from the information source (page 17, parag.2). The Examiner disagrees, because Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects—*information source* (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, col.4, lines 3-9, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the user tiles the document pages in a U-shaped configuration,

Art Unit: 2178

thereby uncovering background documents hidden documents in the foreground—*receiving a video signal as the content from the information source* to display the document objects as commanded by the user. The display changes the video signal so as to bring the document contents (strings, images, etc) to the forefront.

Regarding claim 28, the Applicants indicate that Lucas' documents in ushaped pile does not represent the inset images (page 18, parag.1). The Examiner disagrees, because Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents, such as scanned documents, which contain strings, and images—*inset image*-- on a screen or viewer. A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—*receiving a request from the subscriber for displaying at least a page and content from an information source* -- for defining parent-child relationships among the documents (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7, col.4, lines 3-9).

Claims 15, 21, 23, 25, 26, and 29 are rejected at least for the same reasons established above.

Regarding claims 24, and 53, the Applicants indicate that Lucas does not teach wrapping around the displayed content (pages 20-21). The Examiner disagrees, because the limitations are directed towards the limitations of claim 20, and therefore are similarly rejected. However, Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents, which contain strings, and images, on a screen or viewer. A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—*receiving a request from the subscriber for displaying at least one page* -- for defining parent-child relationships among

Art Unit: 2178

the documents (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7, col.4, lines 3-9). Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *wrapping around the displayed content from the information source*. However, Levine teaches automatically wrapping a word to the next line, when a typing cursor comes close by to margins found in the document (col.17, lines 66-col.18, line 12). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, Cassorla, and Levine to wrap text around the document contents, because teaches above automatically aligning the text in accordance to pre-established margins. This has the benefit of allowing whole document portions, such as image, to remain in the document without affecting the layout of the portions, and user to view the whole document.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2178

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Vertelney et al. (Pat. # 5,341,293 A).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (571)-273-8300 (for all Formal communications intended for entry)


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

10/26/05